

EXHIBIT 7

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

Leila Green Little, *et al.*,
Plaintiffs,

v.

Llano County, *et al.*,
Defendants,

Case No. 1:22-CV-00424-RP

DEFENDANT'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION TO
DEFENDANT LLANO COUNTY, SET TWO

TO: **Plaintiffs**, Leila Green Little, et al., by and through their attorneys of record, Ellen Leonida, BraunHagey & Borden, LLP, 351 California Street, 10th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94104, and Ryan A. Botkin, Wittliff Cutter PLLC, 1209 Nueces Street, Austin, Texas 78701;
Defendants, Llano County, et al., by and through their attorneys of record, Jonathan Mitchell, 111 Congress Ave. Suite 400, Austin, Texas, 78701, Dwain K. Rogers, Llano County Attorney, Matthew L. Rienstra, First Assistant County Attorney, 801 Ford Street, Llano, Texas 78643.

COMES NOW Defendant, Llano County, in the above entitled and numbered cause and serves its objections and answers to Plaintiff's Second Set of Requests for Production of Documents.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Dwain K. Rogers

Jonathan F. Mitchell

Texas Bar No. 24075463
111 Congress Ave. Suite 400
Austin, Texas 78701

Dwain K. Rogers

Texas Bar No. 00788311
County Attorney

Matthew L. Rienstra

First Assistant County Attorney
Texas Bar No. 16908020
Llano County Attorney's Office
Llano County Courthouse
801 Ford Street
Llano, Texas 78643
(325) 247-7733
drogers@co.llano.tx.us
matt.rienstra@co.llano.tx.us

Counsel for Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of Defendant Llano County's Objections, Answers, and Responses to Plaintiffs' Second Set of Request for Production was served by Drop Box and/or email on this the 14th day of October, 2022.

Dwain K. Rogers

Jonathan F. Mitchell

Texas Bar No. 24075463
111 Congress Ave. Suite 400
Austin, Texas 78701

Dwain K. Rogers

Texas Bar No. 00788311
County Attorney

Matthew L. Rienstra

First Assistant County Attorney
Texas Bar No. 16908020
Llano County Attorney's Office
Llano County Courthouse
801 Ford Street
Llano, Texas 78643
(325) 247-7733
drogers@co.llano.tx.us
matt.rienstra@co.llano.tx.us

Counsel for Defendants

OBJECTIONS TO DEFINITIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

1. Defendant Llano County objects to the definition of "inappropriate content" because it assumes facts not in evidence, namely to the extent it asserts or implies that Defendant Llano County or any other Defendant has taken the position that any particular materials are inappropriate as defined by Plaintiffs.

2. Defendant Llano County objects to the definition of "Library Board" as inaccurate and assumes facts not in evidence, specifically because the group of individuals named in the definition are members of the Llano County Library Advisory Board, which is strictly advisory in nature.

3. Defendant Llano County objects to Plaintiffs' definitions and instructions to the extent any such definition or instruction, in particular the instruction related to compilation of a privilege log, would impose a burden on Defendant in excess of the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7:

ALL COMMUNICATIONS between or among LIBRARY STAFF.

OBJECTION: The request is overbroad and vague as to its use of the words/phrase "all." The word "all" can be construed as "total," "whole sum," "whole number," and "whole quantity." To the extent the requested communications have nothing to do with the Plaintiffs or the subject matter of this lawsuit, they are not relevant. Further, Objection is made as this request is not relevant to any issue before the court, as Plaintiffs have sued for violation of their first amendment rights. Subject to the objections, Defendant County answers as follows:

RESPONSE: See documents with bates stamp numbers COUNTY 7 RFP S2 00001 - 01302.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8:

ALL COMMUNICATIONS between or among the COMISSIONERS regarding the LIBRARY SYSTEM.

OBJECTION: The request is overbroad and vague as to its use of the words/phrase “all.” The word “all” can be construed as “total,” “whole sum,” “whole number,” and “whole quantity.” To the extent the requested communications have nothing to do with the Plaintiffs or the subject matter of this lawsuit, they are not relevant. Further, Objection is made as this request is not relevant to any issue before the court, as Plaintiffs have sued for violation of their first amendment rights. Subject to the objections, Defendant County answers as follows:

RESPONSE: See documents with bates stamp numbers COUNTY 8 RFP S2 00001- 00063. In addition, please see the following documents previously produced in response to Plaintiffs First Set of Request for Production: MOSS 5 RFP 00075-00080.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9:

ALL DOCUMENTS and COMMUNICATIONS regarding alterations or changes to LIBRARY SYSTEM POLICIES, including but not limited to the revised POLICIES themselves.

OBJECTION: The request is overbroad and vague as to its use of the words/phrase “all.” The word “all” can be construed as “total,” “whole sum,” “whole number,” and “whole quantity.” To the extent the requested documents and communications have nothing to do with the Plaintiffs or the subject matter of this lawsuit, they are not relevant. Further, Objection is made as this request is not relevant to any issue before the court, as Plaintiffs have sued for violation of their first amendment rights. Subject to the objections, Defendant County answers as follows:

RESPONSE: See documents with bates stamp numbers COUNTY 9 RFP S2 00001 - 00175. In addition, please see the following documents previously produced in response to Plaintiffs First Set of Request for Production: MILUM 2 RFP 00128, 00197, 00223-00228 and MILUM 3 RFP 00478-00491, 00496.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:

ALL COMMUNICATIONS RELATED TO PLAINTIFFS.

OBJECTION: None

RESPONSE: See documents with bates stamp numbers COUNTY 10 RFP S2 00001 – 00047 & LLANO CO 10 RFP S2. In addition, please see the following documents previously produced in response to Plaintiffs First Set of Request for Production: MOSS 4 RFP 00073.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:

DOCUMENTS SUFFICIENT TO identify all books “weeded” from 2017 to present, as that term is used in Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for a Preliminary Injunction.

OBJECTION: The request is overbroad and vague as to its use of the words/phrase “all books.” The word “all” can be construed as “total,” “whole sum,” “whole number,” and “whole quantity.” To the extent the requested list of weeded books has nothing to do with the Plaintiffs or the subject matter of this lawsuit, they are not relevant. The request is further overbroad because the request to produce a list of books weeded as far back as 2017 is well before any of the alleged injuries to Plaintiffs or alleged actions by Defendants as asserted in the pleadings. Subject to the objections, Defendant County answers as follows:

RESPONSE: See documents with bates stamp numbers COUNTY 11 RFP S2 00001 - 02026. In addition, please see the following documents previously produced in response to Plaintiffs First Set of Request for Production: MILUM 1 RFP 00001-000087. Note that there are no responsive documents earlier than 2018 because the Llano County Library System software, known as Apollo, does not archive these records from any dates earlier than 2018.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:

DOCUMENTS SUFFICIENT TO identify all books that were not “weeded” from 2017 to present, but met the LIBRARY SYSTEM’s “established criteria for ‘weeding.’” as that phrase is used in Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for a Preliminary Injunction.

OBJECTION: The request is overbroad and vague as to its use of the words/phrase “all books that were not weeded.” The word “all” can be construed as “total,” “whole sum,” “whole number,” and “whole quantity.” To the extent the requested list of “not weeded” books has nothing to do with the Plaintiffs or the subject matter of this lawsuit, they are not relevant. The request is further overbroad because the request to produce a list of books not weeded as far back as 2017 is well before any of the alleged injuries to Plaintiffs or alleged actions by Defendants as asserted in the pleadings. Subject to the objections, Defendant County answers as follows:

RESPONSE: There are no documents responsive to this request or sufficient to identify all books that were not weeded but met weeding criteria. The decision to weed any book pursuant to the CREW and MUSTIE weeding criteria is made on an individual basis by the Head Librarian in consultation with library staff. The Llano County Library System does not maintain any listing of books that do not meet the criteria for weeding in the ordinary course of business, and it would be impractical to do so.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:

DOCUMENTS SUFFICIENT TO identify all books purchased and the date on which they were purchased.

OBJECTION: The request is overbroad and vague as to its use of the words/phrase “all books.” The word “all” can be construed as “total,” “whole sum,” “whole number,” and “whole quantity.” To the extent the requested list of purchased books has nothing to do with the Plaintiffs or the subject matter of this lawsuit, they are not relevant. Subject to the objections, Defendant County answers as follows:

RESPONSE: See documents with bates stamp numbers COUNTY 13 RFP S2 00001 - 00128.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14:

ALL COMMUNICATIONS RELATED TO THIS LAWSUIT.

OBJECTION: Defendants object to the extent this request requires the production of documents protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work product privilege. Please see the Privilege Log spreadsheet, which will be supplemented as necessary.

RESPONSE: See documents with bates stamp numbers COUNTY 14 RFP S2 00001 – 00245. Defendant will supplement as necessary.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:

ALL DOCUMENTS and COMMUNICATIONS RELATED TO the County' s 2022-2023 fiscal year budget. including communications related to the decrease in the LIBRARY SYSTEM'S budget.

OBJECTION: The request is overbroad and vague as to its use of the words/phrase “all documents and communications related to the County’s 2022-2023 fiscal year budget.” The word “all” can be construed as “total,” “whole sum,” “whole number,” and “whole quantity.” To the extent the requested documents and communications have nothing to do with the Plaintiffs or the subject matter of this lawsuit, they are not relevant. Further, Objection is made as this request is not relevant to any issue before the court, as Plaintiffs have sued for violation of their first amendment rights, and the County’s Budget for the Llano County Library System is not relevant to such claims. Subject to the objections, Defendant County answers as follows:

RESPONSE: See documents with bates stamp numbers COUNTY 15 RFP S2 00001 - 00189.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:

ALL COMMUNICATIONS RELATED TO the proposed transfer of the Llano branch of the LIBRARY SYSTEM from the COUNTY to the CITY.

OBJECTION: The request is overbroad and vague as to its use of the words/phrase “all documents and communications related to the proposed transfer of the Llano branch of the Library System from the County to the City.” The word “all” can be construed as “total,” “whole sum,” “whole number,” and “whole quantity.” To the extent the requested communications have nothing to do with the Plaintiffs or the subject matter of this lawsuit, they are not relevant. Further, Objection is made as this request is not relevant to any issue before the court, as Plaintiffs have sued for violation of their first amendment rights. Subject to the objections, Defendant County answers as follows:

RESPONSE: See documents with bates stamp numbers COUNTY 16 RFP S2 00001 - 00034.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:

ALL COMPLAINTS related to DEFENDANTS’ censorship of any content within the LIBRARY SYSTEM.

OBJECTION: Defendant Llano County objects to this request as the word “censorship” assumes facts not in evidence. Subject to the objection, Defendant County answers as follows:

RESPONSE: There are no documents responsive to this request.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18:

ALL DOCUMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS RELATED TO OVERDRIVE, including, but not limited to, the decision to terminate access to OVERDRIVE.

OBJECTION: None.

RESPONSE: See documents with bates stamp numbers COUNTY 18 RFP S2 00001 – 00236. In addition, please see the following documents previously produced in response to Plaintiffs First Set of Request for Production: MILUM 3 RFP 00353, 00367, 00370, 00372, 00379, 00384-00385. MOSS 3 RFP 00017, 00019-00033, 00037-00040, 00043-00044, 00046-00047. COUNTY 2 RFP 00048-00058, 00062-00063, 00072-00073.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:

ALL DOCUMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS RELATED TO BIBLIOTHECA, including, but not limited to, the decision to purchase access to BIBLIOTHECA.

OBJECTION: None.

RESPONSE: See documents with bates stamp numbers COUNTY 19 RFP S2 00001 - 00073.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20:

ALL DOCUMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS RELATED TO the anonymous "donor" of books referenced in Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs Motion for a Preliminary Injunction.

OBJECTION: None.

RESPONSE: There are no documents responsive to this Request.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 21:

DOCUMENTS SUFFICIENT TO REFLECT the number of books requested via INTER LIBRARY loans placed from 2017 to present.

OBJECTION: The request is overbroad because the request to produce a list of books requested via Inter Library loans as far back as 2017 is well before any of the alleged injuries to Plaintiffs or alleged actions by Defendants as asserted in the pleadings. Further, Objection is made as this request is not relevant to any issue before the court, as Plaintiffs have sued for violation of their first amendment rights. Subject to the objections, Defendant County answers as follows:

RESPONSE: See documents with bates stamp numbers COUNTY 21 RFP S2 00001 – 00112. Additional documents will be provided once a server migration is complete.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 22:

DOCUMENTS SUFFICIENT TO REFLECT the number of books checked out via INTER LIBRARY loans placed from 2017 to present.

OBJECTION: The request is overbroad because the request to produce a list of books

checked out via Inter Library loans as far back as 2017 is well before any of the alleged injuries to Plaintiffs or alleged actions by Defendants as asserted in the pleadings. Further, Objection is made as this request is not relevant to any issue before the court, as Plaintiffs have sued for violation of their first amendment rights. Subject to the objections, Defendant County answers as follows:

RESPONSE: See documents with bates stamp numbers COUNTY 22 & 23 RFP S2 00001 - 00068. Additional documents will be provided once a server migration is complete.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 23:

DOCUMENTS SUFFICIENT TO REFLECT the number of books checked out via IN-HOUSE CHECK-OUT from 2017 to present.

OBJECTION: The request is overbroad because the request to produce a list of books checked out via in house checkout as far back as 2017 is well before any of the alleged injuries to Plaintiffs or alleged actions by Defendants as asserted in the pleadings. Further, Objection is made as this request is not relevant to any issue before the court, as Plaintiffs have sued for violation of their first amendment rights. Subject to the objections, Defendant County answers as follows:

RESPONSE: Documents will be provided with Request for Production No. 21 and No. 22: See documents with bates stamp numbers COUNTY 22 & 23 RFP S2 00001 - 00068.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 24:

ALL DOCUMENTS reflecting LIBRARY ADVISORY BOARD minutes.

OBJECTION: None.

RESPONSE: See documents with bates stamp numbers COUNTY 24 RFP S2 00001 – 00043 & LLANO CO 24 RFP S2 1-9. In addition, please see the following documents previously produced in response to Plaintiffs First Set of Request for Production: MILUM 2 RFP 00091 and WALLACE EMAIL ATTACHMENT 00173.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 25:

ALL COMMUNICATIONS sent by LIBRARY STAFF from their Yahoo email accounts, or any other non-COUNTY accounts, related to the LIBRARY SYSTEM.

OBJECTION: The request is overbroad and vague as to its use of the words/phrase “all communications.” The word “all” can be construed as “total,” “whole sum,” “whole number,” and “whole quantity.” To the extent the requested communications have nothing to do with the Plaintiffs or the subject matter of this lawsuit, they are not relevant. Subject to the objections, Defendant County answers as follows:

RESPONSE: Responsive documents will be provided once a server migration is complete.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 26:

ALL DOCUMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS RELATED TO COMPLAINTS
regarding Amber Milum by LIBRARY STAFF or patrons.

OBJECTION: The request is overbroad and vague as to its use of the words/phrase “all documents and communications.” The word “all” can be construed as “total,” “whole sum,” “whole number,” and “whole quantity.” To the extent the requested documents and communications have nothing to do with the Plaintiffs or the subject matter of this lawsuit, they are not relevant. Subject to the objections, Defendant County answers as follows:

RESPONSE: See documents with bates stamp numbers COUNTY 26 RFP S2 00001 – 00006.